

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated March 5, 2004, having a shortened statutory period set to expire June 5, 2004.

In paragraph 2 of the present Office Action, Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,265,163 to *Golding et al.* (*Golding*). In addition, in paragraph 17 of the present Office Action, Claims 2, 8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Golding* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,375,243 to *Parzych et al* (*Parzych*). Those rejections are respectfully traversed, and favorable reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Golding* (whether considered individually or in combination with *Parzych*) does not render the present claims unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 or 103 because the cited references do not teach or suggest each claimed feature. For example, with respect to exemplary Claim 7, the prior art of record does not teach or suggest “startup software that, when executed by said processor during a boot process, interrogates the boot device for password information and, responsive to the boot device supplying password information corresponding to that of a trusted boot device, boots the data processing system utilizing the boot device” (emphasis supplied).

With respect to the above feature of Claim 7, paragraph 3 of the present Office Action cites col. 5, lines 18-26 of *Golding*, which teaches:

The system checks ... whether security level A or security level B password was entered by the user. A security level A password is a trigger to the system to attempt ... the initial boot from a diskette ..., whereas a security level B user password triggers the system to attempt ... the initial boot from the fixed disk.


In other words, *Golding* clearly teaches that the system boots from a boot device in response to the user entering a correct password. This teaching stands in direct conflict with the claimed invention, which again requires that the startup software boots the data processing system

"responsive to the boot device supplying password information corresponding to that of a trusted boot device." Thus, the present invention requires that the boot device itself, not a user, supplies the password information. Because such a feature is not taught or suggested by *Golding* (and/or *Parzych*), Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of exemplary Claim 7, similar Claims 1 and 12, and their respective dependent claims are overcome.

Having now responded to each rejection set forth in the present Office Action, Applicant believes all pending claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests such allowance.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be required. If any fee or extension of time is required, please charge any necessary fees to IBM Corporation Deposit Account 50-0563.

Respectfully submitted,


Brian F. Russell
Registration No. 40,796
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
P.O. Box 201720
Austin, Texas 78720-1720
(512) 343-6116
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT